The views expressed in this paper are those of the author and do not necessarily reflect the views of the Department of Defense or any of its agencies. This document may not be released for open publication until it has been cleared by the appropriate military service or government agency.



A NEW ROLE EMERGING FOR THE UNITED NATIONS: AN ERA OF SUPRALATERALISM UNFOLDS WHILE THE REMARKABLE TRINITY EVOLVES INTO A DIAMOND

BY

LIEUTENANT COLONEL RICHARD J. McCALLUM United States Army

DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT A:

Approved for public release. Distribution is unlimited.

USAWC CLASS OF 1995



U.S. ARMY WAR COLLEGE, CARLISLE BARRACKS, PA 17013-5050

Duic quality inspected 4

20000619 019

UNCLASSIFIED

USAWC STRATEGIC RESEARCH PROJECT

The views expressed in this paper are those of the author and do not necessarily reflect the views of the Department of Defense or any of its agencies. This document may not be released for open publication until it has been cleared by the appropriate military service or government agency.

A NEW ROLE EMERGING FOR THE UNITED NATIONS: AN ERA OF SUPRALATERALISM UNFOLDS WHILE THE REMARKABLE TRINITY EVOLVES INTO A DIAMOND

by

Lieutenant Colonel (P) Richard J. McCallum United States Army

Dr. David Jablonsky Project Adviser

DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT A: Approved for public release. Distribution is unlimited.

U.S. Army War College Carlisle Barracks, Pennsylvania 17013

UNCLASSIFIED

ABSTRACT

AUTHOR: Richard J. McCallum (LTC,P), USA

TITLE: A New Role Emerging for the United Nations: An Era of

Supralateralism unfolds while the Remarkable Trinity

evolves into a Diamond

FORMAT: Individual Study Project

DATE: 18 April 1995, PAGES: 18, CLASSIFICATION: Unclassified

We are witnessing the early stages of a major transition in the method used by nations to resolve their problems and address their security needs. Increasingly, the United Nations is emerging during this time of transition with an expanded role as the world's preeminent supranational institution. This paper will suggest that the future strategy for global security will be discovered in the dialogue and policy consensus that is developed within the halls of the United Nations. Furthermore, this essay will explore a new and emerging challenge for the United Nations to make a significant contribution to world order, stability and security by moving beyond the roles of peacekeeping, peacemaking and peace enforcement into a new role of planetkeeping. nation-state appears not only to be losing its control and integrity, but to be the wrong type of international actor to deal with new security demands. Consequently, a nation's foreign policy is frequently grounded in United Nations acceptance and the opinion and support of that institution is changing the traditional interaction of Clausewitz's remarkable Trinity. Each country must realize that it is living within a web of relationships that is irreversibly interdependent. The United Nations must be prepared to serve as the leader of a new global security strategy. It is in a unique position to orchestrate the ways and means that will be necessary to achieve the desired ends of a new international agenda. We need a United Nations that is willing to provide mankind with a sense of security and demonstrate the characteristics of a global statesman.

Without question, historians will look back and consider the decade of the 1990s as a watershed period of time in the annuals of international relations. The breakup of the Soviet Union and the end of the Cold War have truly marked the beginning of a new world era. We are witnessing the early stages of a major transition in the method used by nations to resolve their problems and address their security needs. A global agenda is developing based upon common values and goals. This agenda is most frequently articulated as international peace and security. Increasingly, the United Nations is emerging during this time of transition with an expanded role as the world's preeminent supranational institution.

This paper will suggest that the future strategy for global security will be discovered in the dialogue and policy consensus that is developed within the halls of the United Nations. Within this discussion, this essay will also explore a new and emerging challenge for the United Nations to make a significant contribution to world order, stability and security by moving beyond the roles of peacekeeping, peacemaking and peace enforcement into a new role of planetkeeping. In this regard, it has been pointed out that "the end of the Cold War has released the full impact of basic forces that are transforming the world and the relations among states; security is now measured as much in economic and environmental as in military and political terms."(1)

I. Past and Future:

For over seventy years, many world leaders have articulated the importance of collective security and its ability to provide economic prosperity, political stability and military security. For almost fifty years, the United Nations has attempted to provide the forum for peaceful discussion, compromise and action. During this time, more than 180 nation-states have attempted to debate their differences and build a protective umbrella that promotes collective security. And in fact, historians will long remember the 20th century not only as a period encompassing the two most total wars since the beginning of man, but also as a time when the United Nations attempted to make the dream of collective security a reality. The transition has been very gradual, but certainly discernable. Our movement toward global collective security has taken the age-old treaty and alliance system and subsequently progressed beyond the traditional regional focus towards a more conscious awareness of global interdependence. (2)

This evolution is a significant change from the past.

Indeed, "the nation-state has been the highest political unit with a monopoly of legitimate military power for the better part of five centuries."(3) That is changing. The nation-state appears not only to be losing its control and integrity, but to be the wrong type of international actor to deal with the new environment. For some issues, the state is too large to handle

them effectively; for others, it is too small. As a result, there are pressures for what Paul Kennedy terms a "relocation of authority" both upward and downward, which in turn would result in new structures "that might respond better to today's and tomorrow's forces for change."(4) By far, the greatest attention has been directed upward and outward from the nation-state to such transnational players as corporations and banks and, more importantly, to the enhancement of the roles and resources of international agencies ranging from the World Bank to the United Nations.

As a result, the interests and agenda of the United Nations are expanding. For example, during its first forty years, that institution only conducted thirteen peacekeeping operations. (5) But in 1993 alone, the United Nations endorsed, sanctioned and conducted seventeen peacekeeping missions at an estimated annual cost of 3.5 billion dollars. These ranged in magnitude and intensity from providing 90 observers in Georgia, to the conduct of humanitarian assistance in Somalia and Rwanda, to the placement of approximately 25,000 personnel as part of the UN Protection Force in the former Yugoslavia. (6)

Nations now seem to realize and accept the fact that the United Nations can do some things more effectively when compared to the traditional powers of a single nation or a regional coalition:

The work of the Security Council itself has seen 'a dramatic increase ... In all of 1987, the Council met 49 times, whereas in the first seven months of 1992 alone there were 81 official

meetings ... 14 Security Council resolutions were adopted in all of 1987. In the first seven months of 1992, there were 46.'(7)

This trend of expanded involvement and activity continues to be evident not only within the work of the Security Council, but also, within the records regarding the Operations Deployed, Personnel Deployed and a Peacekeeping Budget that has increased more than 15 times from its size of just six years ago. (8)

Increasingly, a nation's foreign policy is grounded in United Nations acceptance. The result is that the opinion and support of that institution is changing the traditional interaction of Clausewitz's remarkable Trinity, represented in a nation's people, government and military force. (9) Specifically, this Trinity is evolving into a four-sided Diamond. transition is occuring slowly, with the gradual development of a new relationship among a nation's government, people and the decisions of the United Nations. The opinion of the United Nations has become a new and very significant factor that influences the decisions of both a nation's government and its people. Indeed, within the past five years, the United Nations has been quick to either condemn, condone or endorse numerous internal and external actions that were considered the private affairs of a nation-state a mere thirty years ago. More now than ever before, the standards and opinions of the United Nations influence the thoughts and actions of governments and their people. This influence has begun to diminish the normally sacrosanct domain of a nation's sovereignty. For as nations and

populations become increasingly interconnected both materially and morally, demands will increase for effective global management. Moreover, as populations move from an interconnected state to one of increased interdependence, demands will also increase for this type of management that can only come at the expense of state sovereignty. (10)

Within our global community, as a consequence, the national interests and security concerns of individual nations have become irreversably enmeshed with those of other international partners. This relationship is changing the nation-state's ability to express its power and influence. Increasingly, unilateral actions become less appropriate. In this greater and more integrated sense, "national" security becomes more and more inseparable from "international" security, and together both merge into a much broader definition which, as opposed to the narrower military concept, can now include a whole spectrum of challenges, old and new. It is quite possible, in fact, that there may be eventual agreement that a threat to national security means anything that challenges the health, economic well-being, social stability, and political peace of people anywhere in the world.(11)

These forces and trends have turned attention to the United Nations. "The problem of defining a role for the UN in international peace and security" one analyst has pointed out, "is part and parcel of developing new structures of cooperation in a world that is increasingly interdependent." (12) This same

supposition has been expressed by the U.S. Ambassador to the "If the previous era was one of containment, the United Nations: new era is one of engagement in a global agenda of immeasurable complexity and diversity."(13) These complex demands, in combination with an intricate web of international relationships could force our current system of multilateral and collective security arrangements to evolve and progress toward a new international strategy. And as we have seen, in the wake of the cold war and with the end of the cold war-induced paralysis of the United Nations, the world has been rushing its problems to that institution. (14) The euphoria has been somewhat diminished by events in such areas as Bosnia and Somalia, nevertheless, as T.W. Carr concludes, "the days when a single nation could act as the world's policeman are over. Coalitions of UN member states are destined to be the preferred method of peacemaking and peacekeeping in the new world order."(15) The Secretary General of the United Nations, Boutros Boutros-Ghali shares this perspective:

A new chapter in the history of the United Nations has begun. With new found appeal the world organization is being utilized with greater frequency and growing urgency. The machinery of the United Nations, which had often been rendered inoperative by the dynamics of the Cold War, is suddenly at the center of international efforts to deal with unresolved problems of the past decades as well as an emerging array of present and future issues. (16)

II. The Maslow Connection and Planetkeeping:

A few decades ago, Abraham Maslow proposed a theory which

suggested that individuals have a hierarchy of needs which must be filled sequentially. Maslow's model postulates that man has a fundamental need to achieve a sense of security and that this basic human trait must be satisfied before he is capable of moving toward the higher-level process of self-actualization. many ways, the same model can apply to the analysis of a nation's governmental process. That is, just as individuals have this deep desire for security, so it is with organized governments. In spite of the complexities within the web of international relationships, nations and regional coalitions still desire a sense of security. Some foreign policy authorities are beginning to revisit the old idea of collective security whose time may be coming as the third generation of this century considers its merits.(17) As a consequence, some nations are beginning to display a fundamental need for collective security as they attempt to achieve higher forms of governmental action.

In the past, nation-states have sought a sense of security through one or more methods of strategic policy: isolationism, unilateralism, multilateralism and collective security. It is interesting to note that:

Although these four schools are grounded in very different intellectual traditions, they are not necessarily mutually exclusive. One of the key issues for future U.S. national security strategy therefore will be coalition building among the different strategy schools and managing the inevitable tensions between them while trying to forge a new foreign policy consensus. (18)

This past year, in a statement before the House Foreign Affairs

Committee, UN Ambassador Madeleine K. Albright said, "If you were

to search for one term that best describes the challenge confronting the new era, it is 'collective security.'"(19) We live in a global community, she concluded. "Global changes have undoubtedly complicated the conceiving and conduction of U.S. foreigh policy. Ours is a period of 'international deregulation,' and new alignments --- but, as yet, no new rules."(20)

As the web of economic, political and military relationships becomes more complicated, the old alliance paradigm seems less appropriate while traditional security approaches become less relevant. Furthermore, besides the challenges of economic prosperity, political stability and military security, international statesman and leaders may soon find a new theme emerging within the debates regarding collective security. This new security topic, in keeping with Maslow's theory, could center upon the survival of some aspect of our planet's environment, which as Paul Kennedy has indicated, can have even wider implications.

"We need to be concerned about the condition of our planet as a whole not simply because we face a new agenda of security risks such as global warming and mass migration, but also because these phenomena could interact with and exacerbate older threats to international stability such as regional wars, hostage-taking, and closure of sealanes. While the newer transnational forces for global change appear to be on a different plane from the traditional concerns of the nation-state they constitute additional causes for social conflict. (21)

Unfortunately, man has little respect for the environment.

And, if left unchecked, man will eventually destroy environmental

elements and global resources which are necessary to sustain life: "The earth's physiology is shaped by the characteristics of four elements (carbon, nitrogen, phosphorous and sulfur);...

Mankind is altering both the carbon and nitrogen cycles, having increased the natural carbon dioxide concentration in the atmosphere by 25 percent. This has occurred largely in the last three decades through fossil-fuel use and deforestation."(22)

Consequently, it is only a matter of time before the United

Nations Security Council agenda includes a debate on actions necessary to save some aspect of the environment. The central theme of these discussions will focus upon the need to sustain and extend the sense of collective security as it applies to the world's fragile environment.

The past fifty years of experience have prepared the United Nations to manage tensions while developing global policy consensus. In many respects, the United Nations is the common denominator in the search for solutions to problems. When considering the four traditional approaches to national security, it becomes evident that the traditional systems of nation-state interaction may not adequately address the complex web of interdependence that has developed throughout the world. This point is especially true, as we have seen, in terms of transnational trends and environmental interdependence. In the context of these new threats, the day may be approaching when individuals will not be able to rely upon the nation-state to provide their security, when, as one analyst has pointed out,

"the narrowly focused 'realist' lens fails to illuminate many of the momentous developments occurring within, above, and across the jurisdictions of the nation-states"(23)

In the future, as mankind continues its quest for regional and global security, the factors of environmental interdependance may well over shadow the importance of economic interdependance. An enlarged role will most likely emerge as a response to environmental conditions which threaten the survival of man and the planet. Under these circumstances, the meaning of collective security will take on a new dimension.

In such an environment, the beginning decades of the next century will present a window of opportunity for a new strategic approach with the future prospect for global security based upon many of the best tenets from the schools of thought currently represented by multilateralism and collective security. The growing trends concerning global interdependence and global threats will relegate isolationalism and sovernity-based unlateralism to increasingly less importance. We are already witnessing the beginning of a second generation of missions that will be performed by the United Nations because that institution is rediscovering its original mandate. (24) This new opportunity is a type of "superlateralism" strategy that can only be performed by the United Nations. Under this approach, that organization could move beyond its current roles of peacekeeping into its new role of planetkeeping.

This role of planetkeeping will not unfold today, tomorrow

or next year. However, twenty-five years from now, it is possible to anticipate a new or third generation of missions evolving under the leadership of the United Nations. The definition of planetkeeping will be very straightforward:

Military intervention to either peacefully or forcefully resolve a problem that jeopodarizes the collective survival of mankind.

This is not an argument for world government. We are, however, evolving towards a new system of collective security because of increasingly urgent needs to manage power on a global scale. As a consequence, the United Nations will inevitably experience an increase in responsibility and authority. With this new role, some governmental functions will move beyond the parameters of a nation-state into the realm of the United Nations. The logic that permits a shared relationship among local, state and federal governments is the logic that will guide the development of an empowered United Nations. Two key planning assumptions of that logic will become paramount, just as they did more than 200 years ago for the thirteen colonies. First, there are some things we can do together that we can not do by ourselves. And second, the well-being of the whole is frequently more important than the rights of a part of the whole.

III. The UN as the Solution:

Will the United Nations fulfill these assumptions and truly influence the evolution of global collective security? Some would argue that neither the League of Nations nor the United

Nations has ever been capable of influencing global security structures. Nevertheless, some degree of collective security has been temporarily achieved and therefore it is a realistic goal that remains valid, relevent, and merits the attention of strategic leaders.

The fact that collective security has never been completely implemented as an effective system does not negate the necessity of applying that concept in the new environment to a variety of conflicts, both intra- as well as interstate. In this environment, international intervention in the former type of conflict will require changes in outlook, since the concept of sovereignty has long been a basic principle of international politics. Nonetheless, as Gene Lyons has pointed out, sovereignty has rarely been absolute, and the principle has been reinterpreted over time "to reconcile the independence of states with the practical requirements of co-existence and the generally accepted values of the international community." (25)

The United Nations of the future will be challenged and empowered to produce a secure environment that provides the governments of nation-states with the opportunity to solve a number of global problems that are beyond the capacity of individual countries. The United Nations is destined to assume new and emerging roles as the governments of developed countries increasingly realize the complex nature of our social, economic and particularly environmental interdependence. As the nation-states transfer this responsibility to the United Nations, new

approaches to international decision making must be discovered. We will move into a model where international strategic consensus is paramount. The old framework, which allowed for the development of consensus regarding political, economic and military issues, must also be prepared to address environmental and social dilemmas. It is not hard to imagine a scenario where starvation, as well as health and environmental problems may become the central topic of discussion within the confines of the UN Security Council.

In any event, security policies in the future will have to be much more comprehensive in addressing nonmilitary problems than they have in the past if such policies are to be successful. If the primary duty of government is the security of its citizens, this duty will have to include protection against dangers that kill people or disrupt society. In this context, those dangers can include economic hardships and adverse environmental trends as much as invasions by foreign armies. "Human activity that thins the layer of ozone in the stratosphere or that thickens the density of carbon dioxide in the atmosphere," Robert Johansen concludes in this regard, "probably constitutes a more clear and present danger to national security than the unlikely possibility of a major nuclear attack." (26)

How will the United Nations discover the "superlateral" strategy that will be necessary to address the security needs of mankind as a whole? A heuristic approach is needed. In a constantly changing international environment, the solutions must

be discovered through exploratory techniques. After all, the process of strategic calculation is more an art than a science. And, there is no set formula that guides leaders as they attempt to address the challenges of security policy within the context of ends, ways and means. (27)

IV. The Way Ahead:

Collective security is an elusive goal. Nevertheless, as this paper has demonstrated, it is possible to conceive of circumstances that would move mankind closer to the reality of that approach to the management of power. Simply imagine passing through a time zone and arriving in the year 2030. After reading the morning paper, you discover that two remarkable changes have occurred within the framework of international relations. First, you detect that the United Nations has become the fourth element within Clausewitz's trinity and that individual states now consider the world opinion as expressed by the UN just as important as the other three elements of people, government and the military. Indeed, you are surprised to discover that most countries around the world acknowledge that their foreign policies are directly influenced by the opinion and standards established by the United Nations. Second, it is readily apparent that both the authority and scope of action have increased as the United Nations conducts much of the international agenda for these states.

As you wonder aloud about these incredible changes, a stranger walks by and says, "Remember that famous axiom from the

Revolutionary War. There are some things we can do together that we can not do by ourselves." Suddenly, you realize that this simple truth of life has guided the development of man and government for several millennia. The same logic that allows man, as a self-reliant, independent entity, to surrender some of his rights, power and authority to the government of a nation-state has also become the rationale used by independent nation-states as they transferred some responsibilities and authority to a new and more effective United Nations.

In 2030, it is evident that man's quest for regional and global security has brought 'him into a new framework of international relations. And the United Nations is standing as the center of gravity within this new pattern of social interaction. The traditional so-called "realist" view of international politics has very little in common with this framework, since "realism" does not adequately deal with the incongruence that has increasingly developed during the late 20th and early 21st century between the anarchic structure of the nation-state systems and the increasing interdependence of people throughout the world. The new framework, on the other hand, is informed by a concept of global interests that provide a basis for reconciliation and arbitration among conflicting national, transnational, and subnational interests, all focused upon the legitimacy and priority of the overall needs of mankind. (28)

Already in 1971, Robert Keohane and Joseph Nye had proposed a "world politics paradigm" that addressed an emerging

transgovernmental interaction. (29) Now, after more than twentyfour years of development, the United Nations is emerging with a new role that exemplifies this transgovernmental paradigm. transfer and management of power will be the central issue during this continued transition as nation-states attempt to shape a United Nations that is empowered to both formulate an international vision and exercise the decisive authority that will be essential for this new role. National values must foster the development of a sense of international values that promote the collective well-being of a global community. Each country must realize that it is living within a web of relationships that is irreversibly interdependent. The United Nations must be prepared to serve as the leader of this new global security strategy. It is in a unique position to orchestrate the ways and means that will be necessary to achieve the desired ends of this international agenda. Since life on our space ship earth has become so fragile, complex and interconnected, the survival of the planet may very well be in the balance. We need a United Nations that is willing to provide mankind with a sense of security and demonstrate the characteristics of a global statesman.

- 1. Gene M. Lyons, "A New Collective Security: The United Nations and International Peace," <u>The Washington Ouarterly</u> Spring, 1994, Vol. 17, Number 2, p. 197.
- 2. For discussion of global changes and interdependence, see Paul Kennedy, <u>Preparing for the Twenty-First Century</u>, Random House, New York, 1993, Chapter 7 and Chapter 14. And, J.T. Mathews, "Redefining Security," <u>Foreign Affairs</u>, Vol. 68, Number 2, (Spring 1989), pp. 162-177. Also, Robert O. Keohane and Joseph S. Nye, <u>Power and Interdependence</u>, Harper Collins, New York, 1989.
- 3. William J. Durch, <u>The United Nations and Collective Security in the 21st Century</u>, Strategic Studies Institute, U.S. Army War College, February, 1993, p. 33.
- 4. Kennedy, p. 131.
- 5. Geoff Simons, <u>The United Nations</u>, <u>A Chronology of Conflict</u>, St. Martin's Press, New York, 1994, p. 238.
- 6. Thomas G. Weiss, David P. Forsythe and Roger A. Coate, <u>The United Nations and Changing World Politics</u>, Westview Press, San Francisco, 1994, p. 62.
- 7. Simons, p. 238.
- 8. Barbara Crossette, New York Times, January 6, 1995, p. A3.

Activity:	1988	1992	1994
Security Council Resolutions:	15	53	78
Peacekeeping Operations Deployed:	5	11	17
Military Personnel Deployed:	9,570	11,495	73,393
Security Council Sanctions:	1	2	7
UN Peacekeeping Budget (Millions):	230	1,690	3,610

- 9. Carl Von Clausewitz, On War, Edited and Translated by Michael Howard and Peter Paret, Princeton University Press, Princeton, 1984, p. 89.
- 10. Weiss, Forsythe and Coate, p. 4.
- 11. Kennedy, p. 130.
- 12. Lyons, p. 197.
- 13. Madeleine K. Albright, "Building a Collective Security System," <u>U.S. Department of State Dispatch</u>, May 10, 1993, Vol 4, Number 19, p. 334.

- 14. Donald M. Snow, <u>Peacekeeping</u>, <u>Peacemaking</u> and <u>Peace-Enforcement</u>: the U.S. Role in the New International Order, Strategic Studies Institute, U.S. Army War College, February 1993, p. 3.
- 15. T.W. Carr, "Time to Re-Think Security Structures for the New World Disorder," <u>Defense & Foreign Affairs Strategic Policy</u>, London, England, January 31, 1994, p. 11.
- 16. Boutros Boutros-Ghali, "Empowering the United Nations," Foreign Affairs, Vol. 71, Number 5, 1992, p. 89.
- 17. Richard K. Betts, "Systems for Peace or Causes of War,"

 International Security, Summer, 1992, Vol. 17, Number 1, p. 5.
- 18. Ronald D. Asmus, <u>The New U.S. Strategic Debate</u>, RAND, Santa Monica, CA, 1994, p. xiii.
- 19. Albright, p. 331.
- 20. Richard N. Haass, "Paradigm Lost," <u>Foreign Affairs</u>, Vol. 74, Number 1, 1995, pp. 43-44.
- 21. Kennedy, pp. 347-348.
- 22. Mathews, pp. 168-169.
- 23. Brown, p. 10.
- 24. John Mackinlay and Jarat Chopra, "Second Generation Multinational Operations," <u>The Washington Ouarterly</u>, Summer 1992, Vol. 15, Number 3, p. 113.
- 25. Lyons, p. 182
- 26. Robert C. Johansen, "Building World Security: The Need for Strengthened International Institutions," World Security: Challenges for a New Century, St. Martin's Press, New York, 1994, p. 375.
- 27. David Jablonsky, Why is Strategy Difficult? Strategic Studies Institute, U.S. Army War College, September 30, 1992, pp. 1-4.
 - 28. Seyom Brown, "World Interests and the Changing Dimensions of Security," <u>World Security: Challenges For A New Century,</u> St. Martin's Press, New York, 1994, page 10.
 - 29. Robert O. Keohane and Joseph S. Nye, Jr., <u>Transnational</u> <u>Relations and World Politics</u>, Harvard University Press, Cambridge, 1971, p. 398.